

DRAFT

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES BOARD COMMITTEE ON TRAINING

MINUTES

June 12, 2008

A meeting of the Criminal Justice Services Board Committee on Training (COT) convened at 9:07 a.m. on Thursday, June 12, 2008, in House Room D of the General Assembly Building, in Richmond, Virginia.

Members Present:

Sheriff Beth Arthur

Ms. Kathy Brame (*Proxy for Gene Johnson, Director, Department of Corrections*)

Mr. Robert L. Bushnell

Chief James R. Lavinder

Mr. Edward M. Macon (*Proxy for The Honorable Karl R. Hade, Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia*)

Dr. Jay W. Malcan

Ms. Marlene Randall

Captain Lenmuel S. Terry (*Proxy for Colonel Steve Flaherty, Superintendent, Virginia State Police*)

Mr. Sherman C. Vaughn

Mr. Christopher R. Webb

Members Not Present:

Sergeant Charles J. Condon

Mr. Kevin S. Hodges

Chief Alfred Jacocks, Vice Chair

Sheriff Charles W. Phelps, Chair

DCJS Staff Present:

Leon Baker

Donna Bollander

John Colligan

Janice Cosel

George B. Gotschalk

Sam Hoffman

Judith Kirkendall

Lisa McGee

Thomas E. Nowlin

Tim Paul

Roz Trent

Others Present:

Marty Alford, *New River Criminal Justice Academy*
William Butters, *Virginia Commonwealth University Police Department*
Jimmy Chapman, *Roanoke County Police Department*
Jon Cliborne, *Crater Criminal Justice Training Academy*
Douglas H. Cooley, *Southwest Virginia Criminal Justice Training Academy*
Vince Ferrara, *Hampton Roads Criminal Justice Training Academy*
George Haudricourt, *ADT*
Jon R. Hill, *Fairfax County Criminal Justice Academy*
Donald Hunter, *Crater Criminal Justice Training Academy*
Nikia Jones, *Richmond Police Department*
Fred Miller, *Prince William County Criminal Justice Academy*
Sherri Neil, *City of Portsmouth*
Albert C. Oglesby, *Northern Virginia Criminal Justice Academy*
Bill O'Toole, *Northern Virginia Criminal Justice Academy*
Ed Roessler, *Fairfax County Police Department*
David L. Rosers, *Department of Corrections/Academy for Staff Development*
Keith Smith, *Roanoke County Police Department*
Michael Snawder, *Richmond Police Department*
Joseph A. Sperry, *Henrico County Police Academy*
Ronald Staton, *Central Virginia Criminal Justice Academy*
C.V. Taylor, *Rappahannock Regional Criminal Justice Academy*
Dave Vice, *Rappahannock Regional Criminal Justice Academy*
Kip Vickers, *Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy*
Cynthia Weaver, *Richmond Police Department*

Call To Order:

Dr. Malcan called the meeting to order. He welcomed The Honorable Marlene Randall, Vice-Mayor of the City of Portsmouth, to the meeting and announced that Ms. Randall would be representing the Virginia Municipal League on the Criminal Justice Services Board and the Committee on Training, and would be serving out the unexpired term vacated by Mr. Alfred Dowe, Jr.

The roll was called with ten (10) members present, which indicated a quorum. Dr. Malcan asked if there were any other questions or comments regarding the minutes of the last meeting. Mr. Bushnell made a comment that on page 13, to clarify that during his acknowledgment at the last meeting, he had used the term “criminals” instead of “inmates” and would like to have the correction made to the minutes. Hearing no other comments, Mr. Vaughn made a motion to approve the minutes with the necessary corrections. Mr. Bushnell seconded, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Old Business:

Academy Recertification

Dr. Malcan reminded the members that at the last meeting of the Committee on Training, George Gotschalk advised them that some of the COT members met with staff and a representative of the Virginia Association of Directors of Criminal Justice Training (VADCJT) to discuss potential changes to the academy re-certification standards. He then introduced Mr. Gotschalk to update the Committee on this process.

Mr. Gotschalk reminded the members that staff met with members of the COT and representatives of the criminal justice agencies to review and make modifications to the academy recertification process. He noted that the academy certification re-certification process started in the 1980's and was designed address the means by which the Department would approve an academy to conduct mandated criminal justice training. The purpose was to provide an assurance to agency administrators that use the academies for training that that was the principal purpose of the academies. Mr. Gotschalk mentioned that over the years, the focus of the process had changed out of necessity.

Originally, the Standards & Training Section had six (6) field services representatives who spent most of their time at the academies and individual agencies assisting with training issues. Currently, the S&T Section has only three (3) field services representatives. Mr. Gotschalk advised that John Byrd used to do the academy re-certifications prior to his retirement in 2007. Mr. Gotschalk noted that he had become more involved in the process as the process now involves delving into more details. He mentioned that they have also observed that there is a problem with the Jails Training portion of the S&T Section, which affects the re-certification process. Thus, staff did not know how to handle this and marked this deficiency as that on the part of the academy and not a deficiency with DCJS.

After these observations were noted, Mr. Gotschalk met with Craig Hartley, DCJS, who had a background in law enforcement, was a certified instructor, and has had vast experience with Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) to discuss solutions.

Mr. Gotschalk advised that initial certification of academies involves the development of policy, academy deficiencies, lesson plans and inspection of facilities. He noted that one of the questions asks whether or not the academy has a three year plan. Originally this issue arose as a desirable requirement from a chief of police who participated on the original committee which devised the plan. He added that there are also questions regarding policies relating to personnel, capacity, lighting, etc. Recertification looks to see how those policies are implemented and followed. He noted, however, that there were some exceptions. One of the instances he noted was that the academies were following the policies, however, mistakes were being made. Staff needed to take a different look at these types of situations. Mr. Gotschalk cited an example where one of the academy instructor's certifications had lapsed, and the person was not recertified. He noted that this was an exception rather than non-compliance. He advised that he is looking at the documentation amassed regarding all the non-compliance issues that were noted, and some were more of the exception rather than the rule.

Mr. Gotschalk advised that an option was the idea of formulating a certification/recertification

team comprised of persons employed in DCJS and not composed only of staff from the Standards and Training Section. He advised that the problem with the use of Colette Brown and Donna Bollander was not due to their capabilities or performance but with several other issues of their assisting with ACECORE and T-REX. [T-REX is the automated training system where criminal justice agencies and academies can go online and report employment, new hires, promotions, personnel changes, and terminations of employees.] He noted that Ms. Brown has the capability of accessing ACECORE and T-REX and can see where there are problems in the system. In six months, Ms. Brown would go back and look at the academies in an audit and see that there are problem. Ms. Brown and Ms. Bollander can also go onsite and deal with delinquency and other technical issues. Mr. Gotschalk mentioned that he and Mr. Hartley thought that the academies might be uneasy about having individuals who have access to their files in the system later returning to the academies to conduct an audit. He advised that the S&T Section would have to redefine how things are done and the manner in which they are done. He added that there is a difference in defining non-compliance and exceptions due to errors. Mr. Gotschalk advised that he is currently reviewing all re-certifications and that some are coming into compliance.

Dr. Malcan asked if there were any other questions or comments. He then asked the number of certifications being done in a year. Mr. Gotschalk responded that only a third of the academies are re-certified each year because of the time staff needs to conduct law enforcement certification exams, onsite visits, etc. He noted that there usually thirteen (13) or fourteen (14) academies are re-certified between May and June of each year. ***[NOTE: There are a total of thirty-seven (37) certified academies.]*** Dr. Malcan asked if any thoughts were taken utilizing panels including outside members for accreditations. Mr. Gotschalk responded that in the past the academy directors have done audits of DCJS. He noted that this process would involve a training issue. One reason that the re-certification is set up the way it is to allow for consistency and not for academies to be treated differently than the other. He added that VLEPSC and CALEA use teams from other locations to participate in audits. Sheriff Arthur noted that the sheriff's offices are accredited by other associations that consist of teams. Mr. Gotschalk responded that DCJS is a regulatory agency and has the responsibility of performing the regulatory function.

Sheriff Arthur suggested that the process be called something different. Mr. Gotschalk advised that the reason the process was started originally was that there were no mechanisms in starting a new academy. He added that standards were set for academies to provide training. Therefore, academy certifications, re-certifications, instructor certifications, instructor re-certifications, and other monitoring systems were put in place to look at the improvement and maintenance of criminal justice training.

Sheriff Arthur noted that her suggestion was not a criticism but something the Department needs to be doing. Mr. Gotschalk responded that whether or not the process is being done is put on the table for all to know and staff is open for suggestions on how to do things differently as long as quality is maintained.

Mr. Bushnell asked how many academies had been declined re-certification in the last five or six years. Mr. Gotschalk responded that no academies were denied certification in that time period. Mr. Bushnell noted that this process should be called reassessment as it is implicit in the changing of the terminology. He asked if the Department is calling when an instructor is not certified an "exception" because it is a softer word. Mr. Gotschalk responded that they are

calling it an exception because their process has been in practicing compliance and an exception is made. Mr. Bushnell noted that given that if the Department is not looking to shut down the academy but bring them up to standards rather than penalizing them for non-compliance, would it not be a cheaper and less confrontational method if DCJS used its contact with technical visits to make assessments. Mr. Gotschalk responded that he has mixed emotions about this, and he does not know of any academy that would ignore the Department with complete unrestricted authority. He noted that DCJS needed to be taken seriously, and this might not have been done in the past. Mr. Baker asked could the fact that the Department has not decertified an academy in the past possibly due to the fact that academies are keeping their functioning up to standards and if the academies would keep things up to speed if there was no penalty for non-compliance. Mr. Gotschalk responded that this discussion has been done for years and hypothetically asked what would be the consequences of shutting down the Virginia State Police Academy.

Mr. Gotschalk that the state of California shut down the Los Angeles Police Academy for thirty (30) days. Mr. Gotschalk noted that if you shut down an academy you keep them from training people to perform their services. He added that this year has been particularly tougher during the re-certification process. Ms. Brame mentioned that she believes that all of the academies take the recertification process seriously. However, each of the accreditation authorities indicates that they each are subject to different standards. She noted that when the JCA arrives for an audit, they seem to know exactly what they want. She added that her academy has already pulled the documents that JCA need to review, which makes the process easier. She asked if the Department had given any thought to establishing standards of creating folders and having specific information readily available to them during their audits. She also mentioned that the VADOC has security assessment teams with no “fresh eyes”, which is causing problems. She noted that after the security assessment team goes out, DOC also sends out the regulatory team who looks at the same information with different or “fresh eyes”. Ms. Brame suggested the DCJS might consider this process and focus more on the academies that need additional help. Mr. Gotschalk responded that the Department needs to be careful and not become “nit-picky”. He noted that DCJS would look at this more closely internally as this process has caused some hard feelings and has also opened the Department’s eyes in how to do business.

Captain Terry asked if DCJS has always had only two people performing the re-certifications. Mr. Gotschalk responded that all of this depends on scheduling. He added that Ms. Brown, Ms. Bollander, Thomas Nowlin, and he have all gone out to assist with re-certifications. Captain Terry asked if everyone used the same criteria during the process. Mr. Gotschalk responded that this was the intent. He added that during the re-certification process some academies already had things out there to review, and some people’s eyes are different than others.

Mr. Bushnell noted that he was curious as to what the academy directors’ ideas of DCJS’s involvement in a functioning certified academy. He asked if it is helpful for the academies if DCJS comes in for re-certifications in the current format or do they prefer if the Department comes in periodically. Mr. Gotschalk responded that he believes it depends on DCJS’s attitude when they walk through the door. Sheriff Arthur noted that she serves on the board of an academy, and she thinks that it is DCJS’s responsibility to go through and check on the academies. However, the question is how this should be done. She added that this depends on the attitude as it is appropriate for DCJS to do this. She noted that it is appropriate to audit the academies that they are all in compliance especially along the lines of minimum training standards and that attitude is critical. She mentioned that staff is not out to shut down the

academy but only there to ensure that standards are being met. Mr. Gotschalk noted that if the Department was truly regulatory they would take the approach that the academy is either in compliance or if it is not.

Mr. Webb asked does the academy come up with a plan of action to correct the findings. Mr. Gotschalk responded that no one is set against doing anything for improvements. He added that all of the academy directors want to do the best jobs for their chiefs and sheriffs and that some academies have more resources than others. Mr. Gotschalk believes that academies want to comply.

Ms. Randall asked if there was a policy and procedures manual that addresses academy standards that includes updated changes where all of the academies could look at the changes discussed and benefit from them. Mr. Gotschalk responded that the training directors have an association [Virginia Association of Directors of Criminal Justice Training (VADCTJ)] by which they can email and communicate between each other. He noted that the Department sent information out to the academies so that they would know basically the criteria on which they were being reviewed. Ms. Randall asked if that would be a blueprint for their expectations while DCJS is conducting the review. Mr. Gotschalk responded that it would not matter with lesson plan guide was being reviewed as they should all be uniform.

Ms. Randall noted that there are opportunities to give input in the process that some of the things that are mentioned and creating backlog in putting things together can be suggested as possible procedures for others to use. She asked if there was a checklist the academies could follow. Mr. Gotschalk noted that the Department has a checklist for the academies to use, and the checklist was put together to make sure that everything was covered during the audit.

Dr. Malcan noted that his first involvement in the academy certification process was in 1985, and DCJS has doubled its regulations that the Department is responsible for. He added that the evolution process is healthy that the COT and staff are looking at this model to see if they could develop something different. Mr. Gotschalk responded that he believes that they need to utilize the Committee on Training, DCJS staff, and the training directors to have more dialogue in seeking solutions.

Dr. Malcan asked if there were any other questions or comments. Hearing none, he proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

Appointment of Members to the Jailor/Civil Process/Courtroom Security Curriculum Review Committee

Dr. Malcan mentioned that the recently revised Rules Related to Compulsory Minimum Training Standards for Jailors, Court Security Officers, and Process Service Officers require the establishment of a Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) to annually make and/or review suggestions for change to these standards. He then asked Ms. Kirkendall to present the names of proposed appointments willing to undertake initial service as members on the CRC. Ms. Kirkendall distributed the following list of nominees for the Jailors, Court Security Officers, and Process Service Officers CRC 2008:

Term (2008 – 2011)

- Steve M. Draper, Sheriff, Martinsville Sheriff's Office, Martinsville;
- Sharon Gray, Manager, DCJS Jails Training, Richmond; and
- Joseph A. Higgs, Jr., Administrator, Rappahannock Regional Jail, Stafford.

Term (2008 – 2010)

- Lt. Pam Hottinger, Rockingham County Sheriff's Office, Harrisonburg;
- Douglas W. King, Sheriff, Wythe County, Wytheville; and
- Lt. Shane Roberts, Portsmouth Sheriff's Office Academy, Portsmouth.

Term (2008 – 2009)

- Elton Blackstock, Blue Ridge Regional Jail, Lynchburg;
- Don Hunter, Director, Crater Criminal Justice Academy, Disputanta; and
- Cpl. Leslie Mebane, Newport News Sheriff's Office, Newport News.

Ms. Kirkendall mentioned that all of the prospective members have been contacted and have agreed to serve. She noted that part of the change in the rules for this committee is that a Job Task Analysis (JTA) was done for the positions being reviewed and that a CRC is set up for those particular groups. The purpose of the CRC is to annually review any suggestions for changes to the tasks and duties of each position under the purview of the Department. These suggestions come from individuals who perform these duties, interested groups, police chiefs, sheriffs, and the various agency administrators. Ms. Kirkendall advised that every time a position is revised, a CRC is set up to look at all of the critical issues. These suggestions are then presented before the COT at a public hearing. If the COT approves of these suggested changes, the changes go into effect within thirty (30) days of the hearing and are posted on the website and also forwarded to the criminal justice agencies for distribution. Ms. Kirkendall assured Ms. Randall that as the newest members she would receive an orientation on the CRC and its process.

Dr. Malcan asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, Mr. Webb made a motion that the appointees be approved for the CRC, and Sheriff Arthur seconded. Before the vote was taken, Sheriff Arthur noted that, unless Stafford County was considered a part of northern Virginia, there appeared to be no one on the CRC representing that region. Ms. Kirkendall responded that all of the geographical regions were covered. However, she noted that she would look at this for next year. Sheriff Arthur noted that here were people from both Norfolk and Newport News representing the eastern region. Mr. Baker asked if the CRC was limited to nine (9) individuals. Ms. Kirkendall responded that the rules ask for this.

Mr. Bushnell asked why Sharon Gray named on the CRC and not considered as DCJS staff sitting on the committee. Ms. Kirkendall responded that DCJS Jails Training is an academy, and that Ms. Gray's representation on the committee was as the director of an academy and not as staff. The nominees were voted upon and were passed unanimously.

Standards & Training Reference Manual

Dr. Malcan noted that during the last meeting of the Committee on Training Mr. Gotschalk advised that the Standards & Training Manual had become dated and was badly in need of revision. He asked Mr. Gotschalk to give an update on the status of this manual.

Mr. Gotschalk mentioned that Ms. Kirkendall is looking to see that all of the pieces of relevant **Code** sections are being looked at and are covered. He added that Ron Bessent is looking over drafts and revisions. Mr. Gotschalk advised that if they have a document that someone can look at someone needs to respond to it. He added that he is also reviewing drafts of documents. Once this process is completed, they will get together with various groups to report back to the Committee. Mr. Gotschalk noted that no one seems to know why things were done initially. He added that Ms. Bollander came to him with an Employment and Training Report (E&T) of an individual who has been an instructor since 1984 but never went to the instructor school. He added that when instructor certification standards were developed in 1984, there was a grandfathered clause. However, there are no records that reflect this. Mr. Gotschalk advised that he is looking to add a section to our website that includes: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) List (e.g. Why things are being waived for citizenship, Why things are done as they are, etc.)

New Business:

The Agency's Strategic Plan and How It Relates to Training and the COT

Dr. Malcan advised that the mission of the Department of Criminal Justice Services is to provide comprehensive planning and state-of-the-art technical and support services for the criminal justice system to improve and promote public safety in the Commonwealth. He introduced Mr. Gotschalk to inform the Committee of this plan and how it relates to training and the Committee on Training.

GBG noted that this was an intention for Mr. Hartley to interact with the COT. The agency is going through a process where constituents are coming up with issues that need to be addressed including education post-incarceration. He added that staff has worked on different issues around the stage, and one of those issues is standardized training for law enforcement officers. He added that in these efforts the Department had utilized several studies in 1993, 1994 and 1997, including the Crime Commissions reports and JLARC. He noted that the COT would be involved in the process.

Dr. Malcan asked if there were any other questions or comments. Hearing none, he moved to the next item on the agenda.

Homeland Security Training Efforts

Dr. Malcan noted that the Office of Homeland Security is a recent addition to the Law Enforcement Services Section. He introduced Sam Hoffman, Homeland Security Coordinator, to provide a brief overview of its training plan for 2008-2009.

Mr. Hoffman wanted to look at where Homeland. Janice Cassel. As with any new training program there is a needs assessment program. They have a training program recognizing that active shooter is a topic in the forefront of law enforcement. A set of LE tactics widely adopted after Columbine where a law officer is taught to shoot a person without waiting for a SWAT team to arrive. For the first time they have introduced standardized training from the Department

of Homeland Security and two standardized training courses from DOJ have been used to train 50 law enforcement officers. Subsequent to those training sessions, 6 basic 2-day courses of the active shooter program have been conducted. All of these sessions have been funded through DOJ and Security grants.

The proactive program is through active-shooter and providing funding for valuable training for law enforcement (CIT through VCSS and the mutual Aid session held in VA). Whenever this happens, the Dept of Homeland Security had given permission to fund this.

IED – need for training or bomb squads. They have asked for 11 million dollars to train local and state police bomb squads. Hopefully they will get large percentage of this in August. Janice is involved in an IED – Improvised Explosive Devices – and classes to develop these.

They will continue to find resources to develop training. They are in the business of finding resources and managing programs. If there is some need down the road to conduct training programs, they will review this and respond.

Questions: Dr. Malcan, 11 millions dollars for bomb squad training and equipment. Mr. Hoffman noted that it would be up to the individual entity to decide how they would spend the grant. Dr. Malcan asked about the Grants. Mr. Hoffman noted that they have already submitted a request to home land security and bring the majority of the state bomb squads up to speed. They never get 100 percent of this. This year LE would receive 25% of whatever the state receives. There is a specific dollar amount that for which each department has applied. It would be up to the department to choose how they would want to spend the funds. Dr. Malcan asked how many bomb squads there are in the state. Mr. Hoffman responded that there are 9 local bomb squads, the newest one in the City of Bristol and VSP has their own. Funding was found for each.

Captain Terry asked would the respective agency be required to provide matching funds. Mr. Hoffman noted that the funding is a no-match grant and requires nothing other than the completion of the application. Mr. Bushnell, noted that there were three programs - Active shooting, bomb squad, and what was the third? Mr. Hoffman reponded that the third one would be the finance program. Currently, they are acting on the local bomb squad.

Dr. Malcan asked the members how they wanted to direct staff. The Committee gave staff the acknowledgement to proceed in whatever manner necessary to review the Training Reference Manual and update the procedures.

Public Comment

Dr. Malcan asked if there was anyone in the audience that would like to address the COT concerning matters within its purview.

Doug Cooley director of Southwest CJTA approached and addressed academy recertification. He noted that he used to be a field service coordinator with DCJS for 7 years and participated in the academy recertification. What this has taught him as director and on the assessing end is to

encourage DCJS to give academies clearly established standards. The typical question is “does the academy follow its policies, etc?”. The confrontational or adversarial feeling is that there are different interpretations on how that is to be accomplished. Mr. Cooley noted that we could follow CALEA and others where there are specific standards for all academies to follow there is no standard that they put the academy on it. Same with attendance. There should be a clearly established standard for how this is done. By the current standard, if the academy has a policy and how they meet it is how it should be met. Mr. Cooley suggests that he committee reconvene and establish some standards to avoid this.

Mr. Webb asked that any time you develop the standards there should ultimately be an interpretation. The other thing they put together is a compliance document that suggests what should be put into process to meet the standards. Mr. Cooley also noted that there should be a determination of when someone is in compliance and when they are not in compliance. There is a disconnect in what the standards are and what the staff that are conducting the inspections are expecting. The standards are broad. The attitude was to share information with the academy to know what they are being held accountable to. He noted that he was he was told by staff to not share this information with the other academies as they knew that they academies were not in compliance.

Mr. Bushnell mentioned that if the purpose was to bring the academy up to standards or was it to catch them or if they fixed the problem prior to recertification. Is the extent of DCJS recertification “are you following your policy as required by . . .” Are there certain minimums established by DCJS. For example, does the instructor do a quick scan of the classroom to see that everyone is in attendance. Would this sloppy way of taking an assessment be accepted by DCJS? Would DCJS say that we subjectively do not like your attendance policy. Mr. Cooley said yes. Mr. Bushnell asked would academies ask for flexibility if DCJS wrote a policy for specifics. Mr. Cooley responded that from an accountability standpoint, he would not be opposed to guidance but would welcome it.

Captain Terry asked if DCJS has not clearly defined their standards - are they not consistent with what is currently being done at your academy? Mr. Cooley said that this might be up to interpretation. He noted that initially he was not found in compliance because he could not show how one individual was absent from a class and he took exception.

Ron Staton, Director, Central Virginia CJA and Vice President, Virginia Training Directors Association. He echoes the same thing as Mr. Cooley and wanted to inform the members that he has offered DCJS assistance as the Training Directors Association as DCJS resources are limited. The standards that the academies have are vague. A random review of such that was just started in February of 2008. Mr. Gotschalk noted that they did a more in depth recertification. He asked that the subcommittee reconvene before next spring and come out with clear and concise standards before January so the academy directors would know what to prepare before the next audit.

Mr. Bushnell asked if he felt that he would surrender some degree of flexibility in exchange for more detailed standards for DCJS. Mr. Staton noted that as long as it follows a certain process so that the academy directors know how to conduct this.

Marty Alford, Director, New River CJA, wanted to reiterate Mr. Cooley and Mr. Staton's comments to the committee that he feels safe in saying that no academy wants the standards dummed down or put in a politically correct terminology. However when compliance standards are put in effect they should be objective and not subjective. That is the only thing they are asking for in the process. He does not want to be put in a position of causing harm to the public or the officers he serves. Somehow or someday, they need to come to terms in working with a more collaborative or cooperative experience. He felt that during his recent audit it was a game of "gotcha." People came in knowing that there was a problem and he wanted the opportunity to work with one and correct those problems. When a student is tested in an academy environment the student has the benefit of the criteria to be tested. Should they not be evaluated on the criteria for recertification and enable them with clear cut objectives what DCJS would want to see it. He supports the in-depth review as there have been problems in past years as some things were overlooked that shouldn't be. He is in support of academies being kept to the standards and that those are in the position of being audited are given the opportunity to correct any deficiencies.

Mr. Bushnell asked if standards currently vaguely worded are tightened to not allow so much flexibility, are Mr. Alford and his colleagues willing to give up certain flexibility. Mr. Alford believes that every academy should get the same checklist and be allowed to operate on the same page.

Next Meeting

Hearing no other concerns from the audience, Dr. Malcan noted that the next meeting of the Committee on Training is scheduled for Thursday, September 18, 2008.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Captain Terry to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Randall, was carried unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:38 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas E. Nowlin
Recording Secretary

Approved:

The Honorable Charles W. Phelps
Chair

Attachment(s)

Date